

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION  
JOINT MEETING MINUTES  
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION  
May 17, 2016

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Keri Benson	Councilmember
	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Bruce Young	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	Adam Lenhard	City Manager
	JJ Allen	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Summer Palmer	Administrative Services Director
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Greg Krusi	Police Chief
	Spencer Brimley	Development Services Manager
	Chris Horrocks	Planning Commission Secretary
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
EXCUSED:	Kim Read	Deputy City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Amy Mabey, Tim Roper, Brady Jugler, Michael Millard, Chris Uccardi,

NOT PRESENT: Michael Britton, Ron Jones, Kathryn Murray, Robert Browning, Steve Parkinson

VISITORS: Julia Collins, Megan Townsend, Ted Knowlton

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE SMALL AREA PLAN FOR DOWNTOWN CLEARFIELD

Julia Collins, Wasatch Front Regional Council, discussed the efforts made to begin drafting Clearfield City's Downtown Small Area Plan. She indicated the study group had looked at what types of development would be feasible downtown, focusing on strategic nodes for retail development based on what areas were best suited to thrive.

Ms. Collins explained that three workshops were held to generate ideas and explore scenarios. She also indicated the study group had held a pop-up meeting at Kent's Market in Clearfield for six hours which had proven to generate interest in the process. She stated three scenarios were studied as part of the workshop process: String of Pearls, Grand Boulevard, and Focus on Downtown. She explained the String of Pearls scenario focused on three key areas of amenities and activity connected by a neighborhood greenway. The Grand Boulevard scenario focused on State Street becoming a beautiful boulevard and was eliminated after further study. The Focus on Downtown scenario focused on one giant distinguishable downtown centered around Mabey Pond that created a synergy of interesting things to see and do.

Ted Knowlton, Wasatch Front Regional Council, explained the study group addressed what downtown could become and it was determined it should be walkable, distinctive, vibrant and a destination with a vision and plan for where one could go. He suggested the downtown be organized in districts, essentially a key package of amenities around a key focal point that might orient businesses in walking distance from each other. He indicated the districts had been identified as Mabey Place, Clearfield Station, Access Point (SR193 and Aquatic Center) and Exchange Center.

Mr. Knowlton explained the draft plan would address placetypes as opposed to using the word "zoning." He stated the intent was to address what types of places would best suit the downtown area. He described four types the draft plan would identify: Urban, Town, Commercial and Civic. He explained the types were a way to organize the plan and prepare a key set of recommendations and reviewed them with the Council and Commission. He also explained the draft plan would include elements for transportation, public spaces and parking.

Mr. Knowlton said he had been asked why past visions had never worked to revitalize downtown. He acknowledged without knowing what the plans had been he was unable to address that question. He asked those present for their observations on why things had not worked in the past. Councilmember Phipps commented he remembered a previous plan that provided slides and a package but then there was nothing further. He suggested the draft plan being discussed had implied follow through that would become a vision that would help guide future developers. Mr. Knowlton suggested the City not abandon the vision because it took more time than expected to see or if the going seemed rough or uneven. He also suggested the City not be afraid to change the vision when needed in order to align with the realities being experienced on the ground.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his excitement about the process and the drafting of the plan.

Councilmember Benson asked how developers played into the implementation of the plan. She asked if the plan would be sent to developers to make them aware of the City's vision for downtown redevelopment. Ms. Collins explained the existing zone for the corridor was commercial but the placetypes of the plan would propose more flexibility. Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, noted the market study considered developers and asked them what they thought and what holes and gaps were seen in the market when it came to addressing development. He added the plan helped the City tell developers what vision was held for the area creating predictability when they approached the City ready to develop. Adam Lenhard, City

Manager, added without private investment the corridor would remain the same. He stated the City was totally dependent on the private investment. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, added the current tone from the City to the development community about the corridor insists on commercial redevelopment with little interest in multi-family development. He added the market study indicated commercial redevelopment was viable but needed to be done in focal points not all up and down the corridor. He explained the draft plan suggested the City should be more flexible and open to multi-family development. Mayor Shepherd commented the draft plan would literally change the entire look of the City, reshaping what downtown Clearfield would look like and creating a unique synergy. He suggested the proposition was expensive. He stated the area identified as Mabey Place in the draft plan consisted of two properties, neither one of which are currently for sale. He indicated both owners might consider selling the properties but at what price. Councilmember Benson asked if the City had discussed the proposed vision for Mabey Place with the current property owners. Mayor Shepherd responded that conversation had not taken place yet because the vision was not clearly defined until the plan was adopted. He added developers weren't currently looking at Clearfield because it had only been willing to accept commercial development.

Commissioner Uccardi stated the draft plan could be seen as a big risk. He asked if the individuals in the room were willing to take the risks necessary to reap the reward. He suggested the City needed to believe in the plan to create success. Ms. Collins suggested redevelopment was not going to happen overnight so the City needed to focus on one or two key areas and not bite it off all at once. Mr. Allen stated it made sense to be proactive in one area at a time but that didn't mean that the City couldn't work in another area if the opportunity came naturally.

Councilmember Young commented the current market created an environment where developers were much more willing to invest in the construction of residential uses. He asked how far in advance of commercial development would the housing need to be recognized. He pointed to the proposed map for the draft plan and reviewed a couple of the details that were of concern to him. Mr. Allen clarified that the hatched areas on the map for the draft plan did not mean those areas had to be exclusively residential but rather those were areas where the City should expect to see some residential development. Mr. Brimley suggested the Council step back from the proposed map for the draft plan. He reminded the Council that the draft plan was intended to be one part of the General Plan and was part of a long term vision to identify what was expected to be seen in the community and what the potential was for the redevelopment of downtown. He explained it was important to not get confused that the colors on the proposed map were addressing zoning but rather future land use opportunities that the City envisioned for development in the area. Councilmember Young expressed concern that if the detail was not addressed as part of the plan, developers would come in and say substantial residential development was more practical for specific areas. Mr. Brimley stated that the City already saw developers coming in and asking for substantial residential development. He continued the draft plan helped the City identify where it wanted to see commercial development and where it wanted to see residential development to allow for more of a conversation about the City's vision and the developers intent and how to bring those views together.

Mr. Lenhard asked where in the process the City would get into the level of detail identified by Councilmember Young. Mr. Brimley responded there were still several steps to complete in the

process. He explained the intent for reviewing the draft plan was to establish whether the identified land uses provided a level of comfort for the governing body. Councilmember Young explained he liked the vision but just had some questions about some of the details. Mr. Brimley agreed the details were important so staff could follow up with the consultants as the City moved through the rest of the process necessary to implement the proposed changes. Mr. Allen added it was very possible that one implementation tool for the draft plan would be a form based code which wouldn't worry so much about the type of use but rather what a development would look like. Ms. Collins assured the Council the City would be involved every step of the way.

Mr. Lenhard asked those present if there were any key concerns for the draft plan. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, suggested for the plan to be realized Mabey Pond had to be visible and accessible. Chair Roper commented the whole process so far had created a lot of excitement. Councilmember Phipps agreed and offered he had really enjoyed being involved in the process thus far. Commissioner Millard asked why the City would want to limit urban development to six levels. Mr. Knowlton responded that decision had not really been made permanent. He added development costs raised exponentially with the addition of a seventh story so the draft plan only addressed six story buildings.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE SANDRIDGE LUXURY APARTMENTS PROJECT

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, provided an update on the Sandridge Luxury Apartment project. He explained that the developer discovered fiber optic lines on the property when preparing to demolish one of the buildings. He continued that the discovery meant the footprint of the building would need to be moved slightly to the west to prevent the expense of moving the fiber optic lines which would affect the surface parking. He stated the developer planned to expand the underground parking and extend the first floor of the building over the underground parking as well as expand the commercial use for the building and add another living unit. He explained the changes being proposed were less than a ten percent change to the project as a whole, meaning the approval would likely not need to go back to the Planning Commission for the site plan. He also stated there would need to be amendments to the Development Agreement and Tax Increment Participation agreement to accommodate the changes.

Councilmember Benson asked if some of the fiber optic lines on the far north would still be under the building. Mr. Allen responded one of the lines would be relocated to the east with the closest line remaining five feet from the building. He reiterated the change would add one living unit plus 500 additional feet of commercial space. Mayor Shepherd commented the change would take the commercial use to 5000 square feet and add a vent out the roof for a café space. Councilmember Phipps asked if the width of the building remained the same. Mr. Allen responded the width would remain the same. Councilmember Phipps asked the specifics of how parking spaces would be affected. Mr. Allen responded with the changes the project would have the same number of parking spaces. Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, added the development would be right at its required parking ratio or slightly higher. Mayor Shepherd appreciated the changes and expressed a hope that the project would get started as soon as possible. Councilmember Bush expressed a desire to see better landscaping for the project as well as patio dining if the developer was able to lease the restaurant area. Mr. Allen commented that was the developer's hope as well. Councilmember Petersen stated she liked the proposed

changes. Mayor Shepherd commented the bigger commercial space should make that area of the project easier to lease.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE 2016 ROADWAY MAINTENANCE PROJECT

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reviewed the 2016 Roadway Maintenance project with the Council. He described the different types of products that would be used in each area engineered for improvements. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, commented none of the proposed products would be as good as a brand new road but the hope was to extend the wear of the roads.

Mayor Shepherd asked how much had been budgeted for the project. Mr. Hodge indicated \$482,000 was budgeted with an additional \$200,000 in the upcoming budget year. He indicated the contingency on top of the bid price would be \$50,000.

Mr. Hodge also provided the Council with the three year plan showing what other road improvements would be addressed in the future.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE GATEWAY SIGNAGE PROJECT

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, shared a visual presentation of the basic design for the gateway signage project. He stated the signs would be located near the northbound off ramps at 650 North and 700 South. He indicated the project had taken about two years to get designed and bid. He explained the first time the City bid the project it received only one bid which was significantly over budget. He continued no bids were received the second time the City put the project out for bid so staff solicited bids from three local sign companies for the project. He stated all of the bids included the basic earthwork around the sign but no landscaping and one company did not include the electrical connection that would bring power to the sign. He recommended Allied Electric Sign be awarded the bid. He suggested the landscaping could be bid in phases at a later date or parks staff could handle its installation. He also noted the signs were designed in such a way that they could be moved if UDOT were to reconstruct the freeway interchanges in the future.

Councilmember Benson commented she remembered originally being told the City would get four signs at a price of \$25,000 each. Mr. Howes explained the pricing of \$25,000 each was given as part of an engineering estimate but after attempting to bid the project the City realized the estimate was not realistic. He explained the City had tried to bid the project as designed but the first attempt provided only one bidder with a bid that was significantly over budget. He stated at that point staff went back and examined the engineers estimate and made some additional changes. He continued the City changed the design and put it out to bid a second time and no bids were received. He explained there was insufficient funding to construct four signs.

Councilmember Benson asked if the City could build the signs on a smaller scale. Mr. Howes explained the signs in town where speeds were slower would be smaller but the interchange signs were designed larger so they could be seen from the freeway. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, added staff had heard criticism about other cities' signs being too small around

freeway off ramps so it felt that the Clearfield signs needed to be larger. Councilmember Benson asked if the signs would be seen from the freeway. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion that the sign near the 650 North off ramp would be easily viewed from the freeway. Mr. Howes expressed his opinion that the area on 700 South was so big that a smaller sign would get lost along the way. Councilmember Young asked what the dimensions were for Layton's freeway signs. Mr. Howes indicated the Layton signs were smaller than the designed Clearfield signs but he was not sure of the exact dimensions.

Councilmember Benson asked when the project would start. Mr. Howes responded if the bid was awarded in the next policy session, the contractor would begin as soon as the contract process was completed and the project would likely take about six weeks to 90 days.

Mr. Howes informed the Council that the signs' design included LED lighting along the swoop of the structure as well as behind the logo and letters. He explained the lighting enhanced the visibility of the sign at night as well as looked really nice. He added the color of the lighting could also be changed throughout the year. Mr. Lenhard stated the lighting was an expensive element of the design. Mr. Howes commented spotlights in the ground shining on the signs would reduce the cost by about \$20,000 per sign. Councilmember Benson asked how much more the City was paying to be able to change the colors of the LED lighting. Mr. Howes responded that feature was no additional cost. He explained it would very similar to the lighting behind the sign at the Community Arts Center.

Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council that the gateway sign project was one of the projects recommended by the City's Beautification Committee. He added the project was being funded through the CDRA.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the City would be taking care of the landscaping for the sites. Mr. Howes explained the City already was taking care of what existed on the sites, mainly weeds, but wanted to enhance the sites with a more professional, inviting product. He stated staff had the ability and knowledge to handle that phase of the project on its own. Councilmember Phipps asked if it would be detrimental to the sites to hold off on improving the landscaping. Mr. Howes acknowledged the landscaping was a necessary part of making the signs stand out and attract attention, so the sooner it was done the better for the City's intent for the signs.

Councilmember Young asked if \$20,000 for the lighting was worth the enhancement of the project. Mr. Lenhard explained staff had bid the original design chosen by the Council, but when the LED (Light-Emitting Diode) lighting was priced it was an expensive part of the project. Mayor Shepherd stated the LED lighting provided a much classier appearance but was likely too much to pay for the project. There was consensus from the Council to change the lighting from LED as designed to spotlights on the ground and put the recognized savings toward additional signs throughout the City. Councilmember Bush asked if the size of the sign could be reduced to three-quarters of the current design. He suggested the current design would be too large for the 650 North area. Mr. Howes responded the design could be reworked. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the larger size sign was needed at the freeway locations. He emphasized the intent of

the sign at 650 North was to let people know that Falcon Hill was part of Clearfield and as that area developed it would need a larger sign near that development to make an impact.

There being no further business to come before the Council, **Councilmember Benson moved to adjourn as the City Council and reconvene as the Community Development and Renewal Agency (CDRA) at 8:02 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.**

*\*\*The minutes for the CDRA are in a separate location\*\**

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED  
This 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2016**

**/s/Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor**

**ATTEST:**

**/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder**

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, May 17, 2016.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder